

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA
TAMPA DIVISION**

TREECE A. SINGLETON,

vs.

Case No. 8:17-cv-564-JDW-AAS

**13th CIRCUIT COURT JUDGES,
SUNSHINE STATE INSURANCE,
CORP., SCHWARTZ LAW GROUP, PA,
and MORGAN & MORGAN LAW**

/

ORDER

BEFORE THE COURT is the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Dkt. 49) recommending that Treece Singleton be sanctioned \$500 for filing a frivolous motion. The Report and Recommendation resulted from Singleton filing yet another frivolous motion to vacate directed to an underlying state court judgment, after he was sanctioned \$500.00 for his pattern of filing frivolous and repetitive filings. Singleton objects (Dkt. 50). After consideration of the Report and Recommendation, including a *de novo* review of the finding of frivolousness, and in conjunction with an independent review of the file, the Report and Recommendation is adopted, confirmed, and approved.

A district court may accept, reject, or modify a report and recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Those portions to which objections are made are reviewed *de novo*. *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Objections must “pinpoint the specific findings that the party disagrees with.” *United States v. Schultz*, 565 F.3d 1353, 1360 (11th Cir. 2009). In the absence of a specific objection to factual findings, there is no requirement that the district court review the findings *de novo*. *Garvey*

v. Vaughn, 993 F.2d 776, 779 n.9 (11th Cir. 1993). And the report and recommendation is reviewed for clear error in the absence of objections. *Macort v. Prem, Inc.*, 208 F. App'x. 781, 784 (11th Cir. 2006). Legal conclusions are reviewed *de novo*. See *LeCroy v. McNeil*, 397 F. App'x. 554, 556 (11th Cir. 2010) (citation omitted).

Construing Plaintiff's *pro se* pleading liberally, he objects generally to the Report and Recommendation and specifically to the Magistrate's finding of frivolousness. He continues to contend, as he has throughout this proceeding, that the federal district court has jurisdiction to vacate an underlying state court judgment which he considers to be unenforceable, void, and entered without jurisdiction. He maintains that this court must vacate "the void Judgment" and that relief is "mandatory." His objections, like his prior pleadings, are frivolous and due to be overruled.

Accordingly, TREECE A. SINGLETON is sanctioned in the amount of \$500.00 for filing a frivolous motion. The Clerk is directed to cease screening his documents until he pays the \$500.00 sanction in full. All terms and conditions imposed by this Court's October 14, 2020 Order (Dkt. 40) remain in effect.

DONE AND ORDERED this 5th day of October, 2021.


JAMES D. WHITTEMORE
United States District Judge

Copies to: Treece A. Singleton, Counsel of Record